REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4, and 6-9 are now pending in the application. Claims 3 and 5 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, and 9 are currently amended. No new matter has been added as the amendments are supported by the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner points out that the step of "receiving a working status signal output...and an output optical-signal" is unclear, because it does not indicate which device is receiving these signals. The Applicant respectfully submits that there are some translation errors in the application, and these translation errors have been amended in order to overcome this objection.

The expression of "of an optical interface in a protected device" in original claim 1 has been deleted. Independent claims 4, 8 and 9 also have been amended according to the above reasons. The opening part of this application has been brought into conformity with the amended claims. The amendments are apparent from original description of this application (See paragraphs [0002], [0005], [0014], figures 2 to 4).

JML/kk

The Applicant respectfully submits that because of the translation errors, the solution in original claim 1 is not correct. According to the subject-matter of original claim 1, the data-flow protection is a data-flow protection of an optical interface in a protected device. This indicates that the method may be performed by the protected device, and this conflicts with the step of receiving a working status signal output generated by the protected device and an output optical-signal from the protected device.

However, according to the original description of this application, the data-flow protection method is not performed by the protected device. Claim 1 is consistent with the original description of this application. From figure 2 and the corresponding description, the steps in claim 1 are performed by the device proposed by this invention (See paragraph [0023] of this application). Also from figure 3 and the corresponding description (See paragraph [0024] of this application), the method for data-flow protection comprises the device proposed by this invention receiving optical-signal from a source-neighboring device 10, and duplicating the optical-signal received into two optical-signals. One of the two optical-signals is sent to a selector, another is processed by the protected device 11 and then re-duplicated into two optical-signals. One of the re-duplicated optical-signal is sent to the selector, which selects one of its input signals to send to the destination-neighboring device 12 according to working status of the protected device. Thus the Applicant respectfully submits that the method is not performed by the protected device. Specifically, in this embodiment, the selector receives the working status signal output and one of the re-duplicated optical-signal

from the protected device. Thus the step of receiving the signals from the protected

device in claim 1 is reasonable.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the solution of amended claim 1 is

consistent with the description of this application, and is clear.

Furthermore, claims 1, 2, 4 and 8 have been amended for some formalities.

In addition, the expression "the control end" in claim 4 has been replaced by "a

control end" to overcome formal objection of claim 4.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-9 are in a

condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35

U.S.C. §112.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly

traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

JML/kk

The Director has been authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 08-0750, under Order No. 9896-000004/US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata
Registration No.: 37,166
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1223
Attorney for Applicant

JML/kk